



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 5, 2004

Ms. Charlotte L. Staples  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2004-8443

Dear Ms. Staples:

You have asked whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 212317.

The City of Pelican Bay (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the addresses of three councilmen, the mayor, and the mayor pro tem; the minutes or recording of a closed meeting; and memoranda referencing the requestor. The city has not submitted any memoranda. Thus, to the extent they exist, we assume the city has released them. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302. The city claims that the remaining requested information is excepted from public disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You state that the city received the present request for information on August 19, 2004. The city did not submit the requested addresses until September 17, 2004. Consequently, the city failed to comply with section 552.301(e) of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code

§ 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when the information is confidential by another source of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (presumption of openness overcome by a showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests). The applicability of section 552.117 is such a compelling reason.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses of current or former officials of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. The city submitted the election forms of Councilman Doug McElyea and Mayor Pro Tem Betty Keller, which show that they timely elected to keep their home addresses confidential. Thus, the city must withhold their home addresses under section 552.117(a)(1). The city must release the other requested home addresses.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information deemed confidential by law. Section 551.104(c) of the Government Code provides that “[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying *only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3).*” (Emphasis added.) Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988). The city must withhold the tape from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the

statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.— Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss of the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Yen-Ha Le  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

YHL/krl

Ref: ID# 212317

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. George C. Clark, Jr.  
152 Lange Way  
Rhame, Texas 76078  
(w/o enclosures)